

CALFED PCT MEETING - March 7, 1996

INTRODUCTION

A meeting was held of the CALFED PCT to discuss:

- 1) plans for March 21 BDAC meeting
 - more member input
 - forum for debating issues in discussion sessions
 - consensus building
 - discuss demand management
 - guarantees
 - alternatives refinement process: solution principles
 - equity
 - affordability
- 2) plans for March 22 PCT meeting
- 3) plans for March 26 CALFED management meeting
 - discuss 10 alternatives
 - Category III update
 - South Delta working group update
 - spring run chinook candidacy
 - American River perspective
 - burning issues for alternatives
- 4) the Core Action Package
- 5) request by Category III for a list of actions
- 6) to provide further opportunity for discussion of alternatives.

PARTICIPANTS

- Dick Daniel - CALFED
- Sharon Gross - CALFED
- Steve Yeager - CALFED
- Rick Breitenbach - CALFED
- Rick Soehren - CALFED
- Lester Snow - CALFED
- Larry Puckett - CVPIA/CDFG
- Ken Lentz - USBOR
- Mike Thabault - USFWS
- Frank Wernette - CDFG
- Stein Buer - CDWR
- Kate Hansel - CDWR
- Steve Ford - CDWR
- Kathy Kelly - CDWR
- Lynn Oleary - USACE
- Jerry Johns - SWRCB

- Palma Risler - EPA
- Loren Bottoroff - CALFED consulting team
- Jordan Lang - CALFED consulting team
- Tom Cannon - CALFED consulting team

COMMENTS/DISCUSSION

Meetings

1. KK: Will there be technical support needed for the discussion sections in BDAC meeting?
2. LS: Important issues will be discussed that will need resolution; could use some resources available.
3. MT: Should update the potential of the OPS Group using CVPIA b(2) (*buying supplemental water*) for the Delta.
4. LS: We should update other processes like OPS Group and CVPIA; and discuss options for the San Joaquin River.
5. JJ: Also discuss CVP - Westlands deal and environmental document for joint point of diversions.
6. MT: Also discuss the allocation issue: stakeholder-agency discussions of the Bureau allocation process.
7. LS: Get stakeholders together with technical groups: BDAC-Adhoc meetings, exploring concepts with technical groups: e.g. water transfers, eco-indicators, habitat: 3-4 BDAC members, 4-5 stakeholders, and 4-5 CALFED agency staff together to resolve issues. The objective will be to resolve issues such as demand management.
8. SG: We should create issue papers with multiple authorship and present them to BDAC/CALFED. Papers should be technical information not recommendations. The information is to help decision makers make decisions and recommendations. (*Circulation of technical issue papers would be very effective since PCT-ERT meetings normally just bring up issues and leave them on the table. ERT could be asked to put teams together to research issues and develop white papers on the issues.*)
9. LS: These are not public noticed meetings. Low numbers of tech experts attend. Not all CALFED agencies are involved. We could assemble adhoc groups to focus some effort on issue papers.
10. JJ: We should help the process along by getting key people involved. Such people may have been reluctant to come and/or participate in the BDAC workshops and meetings.
11. PR/SG: We should go through the issues and decide which ones should be sent to ad hoc groups.
12. LS: Stakeholders have been asking for more detail. We can address detail as best we can now - but details really come next year. We can at least present a concise statement of strategy - why actions are put together in the packages as we have. Habitat statements, water supply statements, etc.
13. SB: Concerned about narrowing down alternatives without details available. Dropping alternatives or throwing actions out is a problem without knowing details.

14. LS: Programmatic process; we are not doing detail, nor removing options.

Major Issues List

15. SY: List

- upper Sacramento River habitat restoration
- comprehensive ecosystem vision
- demand management
- identification of essential elements of alternatives
- guarantees for stakeholders
- phasing implementation
- higher level of water quality actions
- water transfer approach (open market or regulatory)

Upper Sacramento River habitat restoration

1. DD: Concern about adopting upper Sacramento recommendations because the package is awfully expensive at 1.5 billion. What is CALFED role with respect to SB 1086 (upper Sacramento restoration bill)? Look to discussion in KH memo.
2. JJ: How is the upper Sacramento a Bay-Delta problem?
3. DD: Those population problems affect constraints on pumping from the Delta. (*Part of solution package.*)
4. JJ: If so then San Joaquin River water quality issues should be covered by CALFED.
5. PR: For the Sacramento River what are the goals? The doubling plan? Other?
6. PC: Doubling plan recommendations are population discrete. Does CALFED embrace them?
7. MT/PR: But how do AFRP and SB 1086 mesh with CALFED? How much of these programs should be included in CALFED Bay-Delta Program?
8. LS: Problems with salmon survival in the Delta can be addressed by improving survival in the tributaries: this is part of the solution.
9. PR: How far does CALFED go beyond AFRP actions?
10. MT: AFRP plan is a reasonableness document. What AFRP thinks can get accomplished. Working paper had many actions, but plan (DEC 95) had to have actions that had a reasonable chance of being implemented.

Comprehensive Ecosystem Vision

1. DD: The CALFED program embraces ecosystem restoration approach, so it goes beyond AFRP.
2. PC/MT: Agree.
3. PR: Ecosystem restoration is beyond Delta?
4. DD: Yes, but there are complaints about this policy.
5. PC: By going beyond Delta, CALFED is endanger of over-extending funds available for restoration.
6. LS: Ecosystem vision may cost \$1.5 billion, but question is how to spend the first \$150 million. Vision is big picture, but start small with high priority actions. This is a big issue with the northern valley stakeholders. We need to do something upstream of the Delta. We also need to refine the strategy for the upper Sacramento.

7. DD: Concern among existing agencies about how the CALFED vision meshes with AFRP and CVPIA, as well as other plans. The visions and plans are not entirely consistent and don't necessarily mesh, especially in the first \$150 million planned. We need support from CALFED member agencies for CALFED vision and plan.
8. JJ: They are all competing for the same pot of money. CALFED plan could coordinate spending. The plan could expand to cover the entire watershed. CALFED could finally resolve many of the sticky issues within the watershed.
9. LS: Our priority does not supersede that of other programs. We can try to make programs compatible. We may be able to get habitat restoration of long-term solution funded; it may not be compatible with CVPIA.
10. JJ: What will the CALFED Bay-Delta Program role in the watershed?
11. LS: CALFED will undertake an Ecosystem Restoration Program that will coordinate activities on habitat restoration.
12. PR: Will there be a coordination manager?
13. LS: There are frustrations in the Category III program. CALFED directors want to address this problem. Technical groups of stakeholders are involved. Coordination manager could coordinate efforts. We are on the verge of hiring consultant to design the structure of the Coordination Manager role. Again, this will not change how programs spend their money - it will only provide a coordination strategy. A single coordinated CALFED effort by 2010 is a reasonable goal.

Essential Program Elements

14. PC: Rather than "essential", can we consider "common" elements?

Guarantees for Stakeholders

15. SY: We are in the early stages of working on this item. Nothing has yet been resolved.
16. PC: This is more important two years from now when we get the preferred alternative.
17. SY: Yes, but stakeholders may not go along with our process and shortening list of alternatives unless guarantees are there upfront.
18. LS: We need to start discussion these now.
19. KK: Yes, it may help shape alternatives.
20. PC: Will there be discussion at policy levels, with the help of staff to frame issues?
21. LS: Not all stakeholders have policy levels, so CALFED must do this.
22. JJ: More on structure of guarantees, rather than details is needed. Also need for those involved to know the limits of guarantees.

Phasing/Staging Implementation

23. SY: There is a downside to staging that causes a dilemma: decision points after each stage may cause unanticipated changes that may not been accounted for in original planning and decision process.
24. JJ: Important to stage parallel stakeholder benefits and degree of implementation.

Higher Level of Water Quality Actions

- 25. SY: No one has had solid suggestions on this topic.
- 26. PC: Focus on drinking water and toxic environmental effects.
- 27. SY: Yes, and salt balance in the San Joaquin Valley.
- 28. PR: Continues to pursue this - meeting with regional boards. Scoping out what people think. Pretty good planning started for ecosystem plan at EPA and regional boards. PR will have something written for the Group with the next two weeks. Will include drinking water agency people.
- 29. SF: Also consider IEP water quality group - contaminants.
- 30. SY: There is a FACA problem for getting stakeholders involved.
- 31. PR: IEP has stakeholder involvement in their workgroups.
- 32. JJ: Drinking water - need to get to MWD people.
- 33. PR: Getting people together

Other Issues?

- 34. SG: What about more San Joaquin River habitat and water quality actions?
- 35. MT: Actions are not detailed enough to determine what is planned for San Joaquin.
- 36. PC: There appears to little San Joaquin River habitat restoration.
- 37. KK: There should be linkages to other programs involved on the San Joaquin River. They are part of the ongoing baseline. What are they doing? How does CALFED mesh with CVPIA San Joaquin River program?
- 38. SF: Need more on No-Project alternative.
- 39. PC: Need to consider operating standards for each alternative. They should be broader than just export/inflow ratios.
- 40. SY: Issues relating to standards need to be developed for each alternative.
- 41. PC: We should at least recognize that new standards will be needed.
- 42. JJ: At least leave the impression that present standards may change.
- 43. PC: We need higher objectives for standards. December 15 Accord was limited. CALFED should move toward a higher level of protection.

Refinement of the Alternatives Process

- 44. SY: We have not eliminated any alternatives. We have combined some and mixed essential elements from others. The new alternatives do a better job of meeting program objectives. Phase II will give us better modeling of performance; performance measure will be simple for now. Look at the list of scoring handout and notice the high and low end limits. The program staff and consultants will be using this performance measure system to further refine alternatives. The ERT will be asked on March 21 to use this list to rank where they think the 10 alternatives score for each resource within this range, and how each alternative meets program objectives.
- 45. LS: We are looking for relative comparison of where improvements are made among the alternatives. The high end is not the target.
- 46. PR: It would be nice to have real numbers in simple relative terms. Helps in problem solving.
- 47. SF: How to you weight the various factors to determine overall alternative performance?

48. JJ: Weighting requires comparing apples and oranges. Everyone has a different perception as to what combination makes the best fruit salad.
49. LS: Don't want a debate on weighting factors. We don't want to make them too important.
50. KK: Solution principles should come into play when weighting factors.
51. SY: Solution principles have not been a factor in combining to this point.

Staging and combining / refining alternatives for March 22 meeting.

52. LB: Handouts showing how we refined 20 to 10 alternatives. Looking for reaction to concepts of staging, combining.
53. SY: Cost is more achievable with staging of actions.
54. KK: Likes it. Institutional items for water transfers not flagged: bring up front in strategy. Staging is good: easier to handle.
55. SB: Staging is helpful; nonstructural are up front; facilities are later. Could stage together; learn from smaller facilities. Start with staged diversion at Hood (*as proposed in Interim North Delta Program*).
56. KK: Land purchases for facilities can come first.
57. LS: Isolated facilities would take 10-12 years. Important to stage key activities to ensure 10-12 year timetable. Recognize this is moving along while doing other activities.
58. JJ: Standards/operating criteria should change/evolve with stage. Standards go hand in hand with facilities.
59. PR: Noted that no facilities fell off the table.
60. LS: No screening took place, only refinement.
61. PR: Is Alt E MWD's proposal?
62. SY: Combination of Curt Smuttee's ideas for levees, Central Valley flood control concepts, North Delta, and MWD's.
63. SB: Alt "E" is an old concept of DWR's North Delta Program. MWD shot this concept down in 1990.
64. PC: Basic premise is that both Alt D and E have no reverse flows - The basic objectives should be met by both.
65. SB: The difference between D and E are greater capacity of setback levees in E. D will cost \$100 million. E will cost \$300 million. H is 'androgynous'.
66. RB: Should we consider staging in No-Action Alt? Does it stage well? Or should we simply show the 2030 outcome?
67. PC: Shouldn't the no action show increasing exports?
68. JJ: No Action should fix on today's condition.
69. FW: How do we show phasing? Time units? End point - 20 or 50 years? Should show staging with time charts.
70. LS: The longer the time frame the more affordable and implementable. Chart should show guarantees and interim targets.
71. MT: Alt E has fatal flaws. Where does water come from. What is the source of the distribution of water in the Delta? Fish may not find there way through maze. Some good elements.
72. DD: MWD portrayed their proposal as a stakeholder proposal.

Issue Teams**Water Quality**

73. PR: Suggests a Water Quality White Paper. Should it include arsenic?
74. SY: Yes.

Ecosystem Review Team Meeting Summary

75. DD: a) Core actions are in good shape. b) Start staging core and basic actions with \$150 million. Package to include setback levees, Sacramento screens, subsidence control by incorporating wetlands onto margins of inner islands, reclaiming tidal marshes (Prospect Island), testing grounds for adaptive management, defer hatcheries to later - work on habitat first, consolidate ag diversions rather than screening, conserve water through land retirement and demand management, and levee restoration.
76. SF: Tuolumne hatchery? South Delta Barriers? Conflict resolution by end of summer.
77. FW: Should we wait for AFRP to work? Maybe we need more than that. We could move forth on a broad scale, and not wait and see.
78. SF: Stakeholders have some conflicts.
79. SY: There may be issues for policy coordinators. Hatchery versus native fish?
80. LS: Are these intractable positions?
81. PC: To some degree, but there is some hope for resolution.
82. MT: Existing hatcheries may have a place; but new hatcheries may not as they would be inconsistent with CVPIA.
83. FW: Are positions of both sides backed up with accurate information? Tuolumne hatchery would not conflict with AFRP. Supplemental smolt production is badly needed now. The hatchery would not be operated in the traditional way.
84. SF: DFG has allocated \$900,000 for the hatchery. EIR process has broad hatchery issues and discussion of role of hatcheries.
85. PC: Should CALFED stay out of this battle?
86. FW: May CALFED is the best place for the battle. CALFED can put in guarantees to the package.
87. MT: The battle is not right for the CALFED management. Let FWS, NMFS, BOR, DWR, and DFG fight it out.
88. SF: Battle is falling into CALFED arena.

Levees - Curt Smuttee: Delta Improvement Plan

Priority System of Levees: 1) western Delta, 2) Steamboat and Sutter Sloughs, 3) Mokelumne forks, and 4) San Joaquin River upstream of Vernalis including Stockton to head of Old River.

89. PR: A lot of request for levees for development. Someone on our team is looking at No-Action for levees and developments around the City of Sacramento.
90. VP: Corps did not restrict local agencies from making new system improvements. Corps can't make new levees or improvements.

Where do we go with new 10 alternatives

91. SY: We are reluctant to apply a screening technique to shorten the list. Instead we plan to display the features and costs of each alternative, and address how each meets solution principles. We will rely on comments to gain a sense of support for 4 or 5.
92. MT: Question last step. Doesn't sound consistent with NEPA.
93. RB: Door has not be closed on any of this.
94. JJ: Full range was considered; those within the range have not been dropped.
95. MT: Package bundles for specific users? or stay away from this approach?
96. PR: Hard to get facilities off the table. Affordability will be an important factor.
97. SY: Scoping in second week of April. 8-12 go to scoping.
98. SG: Scoping starts here. Cost will be used during scoping.
99. SY: Way to portray process?
- 100.KK/PR: Put in timeline to show NEPA process.
- 101.JJ: Good to display qualitative attributes of alternatives in scoping.
- 102.RB: We won't use models to assess and compare alternatives, just qualitative evaluations.
- 103.JJ: Only assess quantitative differences of 3-5 alternatives in EIR/EIS.
- 104.SG: Workshops are more detailed than scoping meetings. (*Scoping is to draw out issues and concerns from public, not to present to public.*)